

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11

12

15

17

15

Plaintiff Edward McKenna moves pro se for reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge’s order denying his request to appoint counsel. *See Order*, ECF No. 15; Mot. Recons., ECF No. 18. For motions that are not dispositive, such as a motion to appoint counsel, a district judge “must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The court has reviewed the file. The Magistrate Judge’s order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *See Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009) (identifying and applying relevant factors). Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 18) is denied.

25

IT IS SO ORDERED.

26

DATED: October 17, 2022.

27

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE